

REMARKS

Applicant appreciates the telephonic interview with the Examiner on July 15, 2003 that supplemented the Office Action of June 11, 2003. During that conversation, Applicant discussed the invention from a high level and explained several of the differences that Applicant saw between the references and the claims.

As explained during the telephonic interview, the present invention is designed to eliminate hardware in the fuel dispensers. Specifically, the present invention is designed to eliminate the receipt printers from the fuel dispensers and consolidate the receipt printers for a plurality of fuel dispensers into a single location, called the "transaction accounting delivery station" or "transaction accounting dispensing facility." In this manner, customers come to the fueling environment and select a fueling station/dispenser. The customer pays for the fuel at the fuel dispenser, receives the fuel from the fuel dispenser, and collects the receipt for the fueling transaction at a remote location - namely the "transaction accounting delivery station" or "transaction accounting dispensing facility."

In contrast, McCall, Corfitsen, and Hartsell all teach paying for and receiving the receipt at a single location. There is no teaching or suggestion that a transaction may be bifurcated at two locations such that payment is made in one location and a receipt is received in a second location.

While Applicant believes that the claims as previously presented did define over the combination of McCall and Corfitsen and the combination of McCall, Corfitsen and Hartsell, Applicant herein amends the claims.

Claims 1, 13, and 14 have been amended to recite that the fuel dispenser has a mechanism to accept payment. Claims 7, 13, and 14 have further been amended to clarify that the "transaction accounting delivery station" or "transaction accounting dispensing facility" serves a plurality of fuel dispensers/fueling stations. During the telephonic interview with the Examiner, the Examiner opined that amendments along these lines would overcome the rejections of record. This stance is dictated by the fact that the references individually and in combination do not teach or suggest all of the claim elements. If the combination of references does not teach or suggest all the claim elements, the Patent Office has not established *prima facie* obviousness. MPEP § 2143.03. In light of the amendments to the claims, and based on the

telephonic interview, it is readily apparent that the combination of references does not teach or suggest all the claim elements.

The Examiner further indicated that while she was unaware of any references which showed these features, a new search would likely be required. Applicant herein makes the amendments of record so that the Examiner may determine if a new search is required.

Applicant requests reconsideration of the rejection in light of the amendments and arguments presented herein and during the telephonic interview. Applicant earnestly solicits claim allowance at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,

WITHROW & TERRANOVA, P.L.L.C.

By:

Taylor M. Davenport
Taylor M. Davenport
Registration No. 42,466
P.O. Box 1287
Cary, NC 27512
Telephone: (919) 654-4520

FAX RECEIVED

JUL 18 2003

GROUP 3600

Official

Date: July 17, 2003

Attorney Docket: 2400-370

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION	
I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS DOCUMENT IS BEING TRANSMITTED VIA FACSIMILE ON THE DATE INDICATED BELOW TO:	
Examiner: <u>Gort, Elaine L.</u> Art Unit: <u>3627</u> Fax: <u>703-872-9327</u>	
<u>Kelly Farnon</u> Name of Sender	
<u>[Signature]</u> Signature	
<u>7/17/03</u> Date of Transmission	